

## **REMARKS**

Claims 2-17 are pending in the case. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objection and rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the remarks.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 17 are allowed and that claims 3 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 3 and 11 have been objected to as containing confusing grammar. Claims 3 and 11 have been amended to clarify the claim language. Claims 3 and 11 claim, "wherein the step of determining the projection further comprises the step of projecting a row or column of an image of the balls in a direction, wherein the direction is one of horizontal and vertical." The Examiner's reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6-8 and 14-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 has been cancelled.

Referring to claims 6 and 14; claims 6 and 14 claim, "wherein the given threshold is an adaptive threshold." The given threshold of claims 2 and 10 may be an adaptive threshold as claimed in claims 6 and 14. The adaptive thresholds may be determined as claimed in claims 7 and 15.

In claims 7 and 15, "one or more threshold values in a threshold searching range" is distinguished from a "given threshold" in claims 2 and 6 and claims 10 and 14. Further, a "preliminary number of balls" as claimed in claims 7 and 15 is distinguished from "the number of balls" in claims 2 and 10.

Accordingly, the language of claims 6, 7, 14 and 15 is believed to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 8 and 15 have been rejected as being dependent on rejected claims 6 and 7, and claims 14 and 15. Claims 8 and 15 are believed to be in condition for allowance as based on claims 6 and 7, and claims 14 and 15, respectively. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejected is respectfully requested.


Claim 1 as best understood by the Examiner has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christian et al. (USPN 4,696,047) in view of Florent (USPN 5,832,111).

Claim 1 has been cancelled.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including claims 2-17, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: December 22, 2005

  
Donald B. Paschburg  
Reg. No. 33,753  
Attorney for Applicants

**Mailing Address:**  
SIEMENS CORPORATION  
Intellectual Property Department  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830  
(732) 321-3100  
(732) 321-3030 (FAX)